

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-15, and 17-32 have been canceled. Claim 12, amended claims 5 and 16, and new claim 33 are in this application.

Claims 5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,850,457 (Gefvert) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,118,876 (Ruzicka), U.S. Patent No. 5,589,718 (Lee), U.S. Patent No. 5,470,253 (Siems et al.), U.S. Patent No. 3,824,524 (Glover) and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) of Figs. 12-14.

Amended independent claim 5 now recites in part the following:

"an electronic apparatus having a back panel with at least four audio signal output terminals for a plurality of channels, said at least four audio signal output terminals including a front right audio signal output terminal for a front right channel, a rear right audio signal output terminal for a rear right channel, a front left audio signal output terminal for a front left channel, and a rear left audio signal output terminal for a rear left channel, said back panel being located on a rear portion of the electronic apparatus;

. . . .

in which the front left audio signal output terminal is arranged to the right of both of the front right audio signal output terminal and the rear right audio signal output terminal on the back panel as viewed when facing the rear portion of the electronic apparatus, and the rear left audio signal output terminal is arranged to the right of both of the front right audio signal output terminal and the rear right audio signal output terminal on the back panel as viewed when facing the rear portion of the

**electronic apparatus,**" (Emphasis added.)

An example of the above arrangement of the audio signal output terminals is provided in the present application. As an example, reference is made to Fig. 2 of the present application. Further, the advantage of such specific arrangement of terminals is provided throughout the present application.

In explaining the above 103 rejection with regard to claim 5, and as best understood, the Examiner appears to assert that Figs. 12-14 of the present application (hereinafter, merely "Figs. 12-14") discloses "all of the audio signal output terminals corresponding to the left channels being arranged to the right of all of the audio signal output terminals corresponding to the right channels . . . ." (See lines 18-22 of page 3 of the present Office Action.)

It is respectfully submitted that Figs. 12-14 do not disclose "the front left audio signal output terminal is arranged to the right of both of the front right audio signal output terminal and the rear right audio signal output terminal on the back panel as viewed when facing the rear portion of the electronic apparatus," as now specifically recited in claim 5. That is, and as clearly illustrated in Figs. 12-14, the front left audio signal output terminal of Figs. 12-14 is not arranged to the right of the rear right audio signal output terminal. Instead, such front left audio signal output terminal of Figs. 12-14 is arranged to the left of the rear right audio signal output terminal. Such arrangement of Figs. 12-14 may cause the speaker cables to cross which may make the installation thereof more difficult as described in the present application.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 5 is distinguishable from the applied combination of references for at least the previously described reasons.

For similar or somewhat similar reasons, it is also believed that amended claim 16 is distinguishable from the applied combination of references.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gefvert, Ruzicka, Lee ('718), Siems, Glover, and AAPA, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,984,717 (Lee).

Claim 12 is dependent from independent claim 5. Accordingly, claim 12 is distinguishable from the applied combination of Gefvert, Ruzicka, Lee ('718), Siems, Glover, and AAPA for at least the reason previously described. The Examiner does not appear to have relied on Lee '717 to overcome the above-described deficiencies of the applied combination of Gefvert, Ruzicka, Lee ('718), Siems, Glover, and AAPA. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 12 is distinguishable from the applied combination of references.

New independent claim 33 has been added herein. It is respectfully submitted that new claim 33 is distinguishable from the applied combination of references for reasons similar to those previously described.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.


Application No.: 09/800,056

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-755

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: January 5, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant(s)

962118\_1.DOC